

**IN THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 1. This sheet replaces the original sheet.

**Attachment: Replacement Sheet**



## REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated January 5, 2009, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on April 5, 2009. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

### *Drawings*

The Examiner objected to drawings because according to the Examiner it is not possible to clearly read Figure 1. In response, Applicants have submitted herewith a new Figure 1. Applicants respectfully request the objection to the drawings be removed.

### *Specification*

The Examiner indicated that a new abstract of the disclosure is required and must be presented on a separate sheet, apart from any other text. In response, Applicants have amended the abstract accordingly.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112*

The Examiner rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because claims 1 and 14 recite the limitation "said output coils" with insufficient antecedent basis. In response, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 14, accordingly. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the § 112 rejection be removed.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102*

The Examiner rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Karaev (US 5,088,638). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 includes the limitations of selecting a plurality of input coils, each input coil having the same uniform hardness, and each input coil having two free ends, fusing adjacent free ends of adjacent input coils together to form one continuous length of rod, the fusing creating fused areas and a heat-affected zone at each fused area, treating



each of the heat-affected zones to alleviate irregularities induced during fusing and winding the continuous length of rod into a finished coil. Karaev fails to disclose these limitations, Karaev merely discloses a method of forming a single sucker rod 14 by connecting a head 2 to each end of a **straight** rod body 1 (see Karaev, col. 3, lines 60-65 and Figure 4) which is clearly different from interconnecting a plurality of coils to form a continuous finished coil as recited in claim 1. It is to be noted that phrase "rolled stock" in Karaev generally relates to a metalworking process to create the metal used in the straight rod body 1 of the sucker rod 14. Further, Karaev clearly does not disclose winding the continuous length of rod into a finished coil as recited in claim 1. Moreover, Karaev clearly does not disclose the steps of removing mill scale from the surface of the rod as recited in claim 2 or placing the rod into compression as recited in claims 3, 4 or shot-peening the surface of the continuous rod as recited in claims 5-8 or inspecting for flaws as recited in claims 9-11.

As the foregoing illustrates, Karaev fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 1-11. This failure precludes Karaev from anticipating claims 1-11. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the 102(b) rejection of claims 1-11 be removed and allowance of the same.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

The Examiner rejected claims 12-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karaev and Nast (US 3,210,838). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. For similar reasons as set forth herein, Karaev fails to disclose all the limitations of claims 12-21. Further, Nast merely discloses a welding wire process and thus fails to cure the deficiencies of Karaev. As such, the combination of Karaev and Nast fails to render claims 12-21 obvious. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the 103(a) rejection of claims 12-21 be removed and allowance of the same.



**Conclusion**

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Walter C. Grollitsch', written over a horizontal line.

Walter C. Grollitsch  
Registration No. 48,678  
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Attorney for Applicant